

1961

name disclosed—for obvious reasons. But his comments are so pertinent to the present crisis which we face in Germany that I wish to have them printed in the body of the RECORD.

At this time I shall read part of them:

A number of the very clever people in whom I have a great confidence told me that Walter Ulbricht, the East German boss, has long wanted a Budapest type of show-down in East Germany. The East Germans have not been good subjects—enjoyed too much freedom and to restive. It is believed by these people that a revolution or uprising is being planned by the Government to take place this summer or early autumn. This would of course be a controlled revolution such as the one in Hungary in 1956.

The Hungarian revolution has long since become a classic example of how to tame an unruly populace. A certain amount of bloodshed and a glaring failure is just what many Communists have been recommending for the East Germans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have just returned from 2 weeks traveling about East Germany on business.

The numerous people with whom I spoke on this trip and my intimate knowledge of this area from several years of visiting there, I am convinced that we are in for some very serious developments within the not too distant future unless the West takes very strong steps to assure the East Germans that it is ready to defend them against intimidation. I hope that you will see that these observations are brought to the attention of the proper people.

Everywhere I went, Leipzig, Dresden, Karl Marxstadt, Erfurt, Plauen, Bitterfeld, Halle, and Magdeburg, I have never found the inhabitants at such a high pitch of tension and determination to move once they have been "sold out." Somehow they are convinced that the West is ready to make a deal which will seal forever their fate.

These people have known chronic food shortages ever since 1938 thus this is of little importance to them at the moment. More important is that the leadership in Washington and London has convinced them that they are ready to recognize once and for all the principal of a Communist East Germany.

Never have these people taken their present government seriously. It has hardly been more than a joke. They have endured it because they were certain some day it would fall, for they are sensible people who know that such uneconomic bungling cannot go on forever. Those who have remained have too much property, too much to lose, to get up and move.

Now, however, the situation is greatly changed. I found valuable family heirlooms being offered at the lowest prices that have existed since the war. I found West German bank notes in 100 mark denominations and gold bars commanding prices 20 to 30 percent above West German prices. An unusual condition.

These people are getting ready for a mass exodus. This exodus will most certainly take place as soon as Khrushchev has a deal.

Everyone I spoke to, with exception of the hard-boiled party members, told me they just would not stay. When I asked them what they would do if the Volkspolizei resisted their movements, the invariable answer was we will go anyway.

A number of the very clever people in whom I have a great confidence told me that Walter Ulbricht, the East German boss, has long wanted a Budapest type of show-down

in East Germany. The East Germans have not been good subjects. Enjoyed too much freedom and too restive. It is believed by these people that a revolution or uprising is being planned by the Government to take place this summer or early autumn. This would of course be a controlled revolution such as the one in Hungary in 1956.

The Hungarian revolution has long since become a classic example of how to tame an unruly populous. A certain amount of bloodshed and a glaring failure is just what many Communists have been recommending for the East Germans.

To put over such a controlled revolution, according to the East Germans, they must build up a fear among the Western powers that will keep them from intervening.

You will recall that during the Hungarian uprising Dr. Adenauer warned the West that he could not be expected to remain aloof if the Germans in the Soviet Zone of Germany were treated as the Hungarians were.

I fear greatly that the American people are too conscious of Berlin. Berlin is given far too much importance. It is merely a smokescreen to coverup what is going to happen in East Germany once the issue of Berlin is settled.

A mass exodus of the East Germans will be resisted by the Ulbricht regime. I cannot see then but intervention by the West Germans. The consequences are obvious.

FISH FLOUR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, since the earliest times, the fishing industry has been vital to the economy of Massachusetts and to the economy of many other States along our sea coasts.

But today the industry faces difficult times, partly because U.S. consumers eat much less fish than nutritionists believe their bodies need.

One dramatic answer, both to this nutritional need and to the problems of the ailing industry, is a new product called "fish flour." This is processed from whole fish. It can be made from any kind of fish, and from fish of any sizes. It emerges from the process as a fine, white powder.

All of our studies to date indicate that this powder is the cheapest source of animal protein in the world. It is an immediate answer to the protein hunger which is such a serious problem in so many parts of the world.

My colleague, Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH III, and Representative HASTING KEITH, of Cape Cod, and many other Members of the Congress have been working for several months to make this new product more widely understood and available. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department of the Interior is an enthusiastic supporter of the product, and is engaged in vital research with funds which we have appropriated recently.

But we have just received the finest scientific endorsement to date in the form of a report from three food scientists at the University of Illinois—Drs. B. Connor Johnson, V. Chalam Metta, and Harold E. Schendel, of the division of animal nutrition at that university.

They have found that fish flour has a higher protein efficiency rating than skim milk or beef; that it has no harmful effect, even when fed as the sole source of protein; that standard East Indian diets showed growth improve-

ments of from 50 to 100 percent when supplemented with fish flour; and that 3 percent fish flour can be added to standard diets without detection by the consumer.

Because of the enormous significance of this report to our fishing industry and to the solution of the world food problem, I ask, Mr. President, that the summary and conclusions of these scientists be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

An odorless, defatted fish flour, evaluated for its protein quality by the Mitchell method, was found to have a biological value of 8 percent. At the 10 percent protein level in diet, its protein efficiency ratio (gram gain per gram protein consumed) was 3.24 as compared to 2.85 for skim milk and 3.15 for beef.

When fed as the sole source of protein, fish flour proved as adequate as casein for the reproduction and general performance of rats through four generations. Examinations of 11 organs and tissues from animals of the first through third generations revealed no differences between the groups.

The supplementing value of fish flour added to four East Indian diets was studied with growing rats using Mitchell's pair-feeding method. At 1- and 3-percent supplementation, growth improvements were 13 to 76 percent and 43 to 145 percent, respectively, over the controls. The protein efficiency ratios of all but one of the cereal diets were also improved significantly ($P < 0.01$) by 1 and 3 percent fish flour supplementation, indicating a better amino acid mixture of the supplemented diets.

Fish flour supplementation was also shown to improve the protein efficiency ratio of experimental East Indian diets containing both a low-protein corn (from 0.172 to 0.242) and of a high-protein corn (from 0.245 to 0.320), indicating again that an improved amino acid pattern had been achieved.

An organoleptic test indicated that a panel of 26 Indian students was unable to detect the presence of 3 percent fish flour in 3 Indian diets.

All these data support the view that a good fish flour could be a real significance in helping to supply the protein needs of the world.

DEALINGS WITH CUBA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am very much concerned about the rising belligerence in the United States. My mail is showing increasing impatience with our handling of the Cuban situation; and I have been interested in the appearance in this morning's Washington Post of an article, written by Chalmers M. Roberts, under the headline "Impatient Nation Taking On Belligerent Mood." After I read the article this morning, I read a letter from a constituent in Utah—a letter so belligerent that I did not dare bring it to the Chamber and read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Many suggestions have been made for military action. I, myself, have suggested the wisdom of a blockade, both by air and by sea, of Cuba; and some of these suggestions are more belligerent than that.

But, Mr. President, in view of all these suggestions, I think perhaps there is an intermediate step which we can take, which is to invoke the Trading With the

Enemy Act, and break off all trade with Cuba.

Last year, after many months of pleading by President Eisenhower, Congress finally gave permission to cut off sugar trade with Cuba, and President Kennedy has continued that. But today there is still a substantial amount of trade in tobacco, molasses, and fruit; and the State Department, which for 5 months has been "studying" the question of cutting off trade, still has not reached a decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from today's Washington Post printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of Aug. 11, 1961]

PRESIDENT PLEADS FOR PRUDENCE—IMPATIENT NATION TAKING ON BELLIGERENT MOOD

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

President Kennedy's words of caution yesterday to impatient and frustrated Americans who would like to work off their feeling by taking a military swat at Fidel Castro seemed to reflect a concern over the mood of the Nation.

In the past several weeks this reporter has traveled to and fro across the Nation trying to sample the public mood as well as enjoy a vacation. The mood is not totally attractive.

Mr. Kennedy cited the importance of the United States acting "with the prudence which is worthy of a great power * * *." But Americans are increasingly in a to-heck-with-prudence mood.

The President's call for restraint was linked to the off-the-cuff congressional demands a day earlier for an ultimatum to Castro over the latest hijacked aircraft. But what he said deserves some broader consideration both in Washington and around the country.

One feels that the succession of Soviet triumphs in space plus the humiliation of the Cuban disaster and the threat of nuclear war over Berlin has altered the national mood in the 9 months since the presidential election. Last fall there seemed to be a lot of public doubt but still a good deal of complacency.

Today there is not much complacency and a lot of doubt about the Nation's future. Nobody wants to go to war over Berlin but more and more people seem to think the time has come to draw a line—and if it comes to war, well, we'll have to face it.

CUBAN DEBACLE IS KEY

But what is most evident is the increasing number of Americans who are in a "let's do something" mood, and damn the consequences. The April fiasco in Cuba has been the key factor here, added to by the plane hijackings.

A lot of people seem to figure that while it may be too dangerous to take a military swat at Nikita Khrushchev, it would not be very risky to take a poke at Castro. The plane incidents seem to provide an occasion and it is remarkable how easily people can forget that so far no complicity in the hijackings by the Cuban Government has been proven. The fact that the Cubans are holding one plane seems enough.

Just how many people feel this way can, perhaps, be measured by Dr. Gallup. At any rate, it is sizable. And it has certain important perils for President Kennedy.

CHANNELING THE ANGER

The Florida Congressman who made the crack on Wednesday about the Cubans having to hijack one of Mr. Kennedy's helicopters off the White House lawn before he

would act, was indeed intemperate, at the least. But he also was indicative of a growing segment of public feeling.

This rising ire at Castro, Khrushchev, and communism had better be channeled and directed by the President before it gets out of hand. A nation that thinks its Chief Executive is too timid or lacks guts can tear itself apart. Mr. Kennedy is no James Buchanan but there could be some tragic modern equivalents of the United States in the pre-Civil War years.

What Mr. Kennedy said yesterday, his prepared remark about "prudence worthy of a great power," was well said. His effort to put the spotlight on his Alliance for Progress program and its positive features likewise was useful. But this sort of thing will have to be a continuing effort.

For a complex of reasons, Mr. Kennedy won his high office by the narrowest of margins. One of those reasons was that too few people accepted his theme that American power and prestige was declining alarmingly and vigorous steps must be taken to reverse the trend.

PERIL AND OPPORTUNITY

Today one feels about the Nation a mood almost of belligerence. There is a willingness, even a desire, to see the United States negotiate with Khrushchev over Berlin but there is a diminishing willingness to see the Soviet boss bought off by American concessions.

Every indication today is that the President has the confidence of the bulk of the Nation and that the Nation is willing to respond when asked in definite terms, as in his last television address. But this is beginning to be an aroused Nation, something which provides both peril and opportunity for Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the current volume of our imports from Cuba has been variously estimated at from \$25 million to \$60 million a year. The largest item is tobacco for cigars. We also import millions of pounds of pineapples, oranges, tomatoes, and cucumbers, as well as lesser amounts of other fruits and vegetables. Our exports to Cuba, I understand, are in the vicinity of \$25 million a year.

There is no question that this trade is of far more value to Fidel Castro than it is to us. The food he imports from us plays an important part in keeping the people of Cuba satisfied with their new way of life; and the money he gets from us for tobacco and for fruit helps him to pay for the guns and ammunition he needs to strengthen the security of his police state.

President Kennedy has told the world that we intend to stand firm on the Berlin issue, and I am sure the American people are behind him 100 percent. Certainly, the Senator from Utah is. But I feel that an equally strong policy on Cuba would strengthen our hand in dealing with the Soviet Union over Berlin, and I think the first step in establishing such a policy should be to break off economic relations with Cuba, just as we have broken off diplomatic relations.

So long as we continue buying Cuban imports, we are contributing to the cause of international communism, and aiding those who would destroy us. When we accept this fact, I think we can reach only one conclusion, and that is that this trade must stop.

If we do not begin to find some intermediate step, I think the rising demand

for belligerent action, including military action, may force us into a position that may be even more dangerous and damaging than the action I have suggested.

PROPER ROLE OF MILITARY OFFICERS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in recent days, certain Members of the Senate have undertaken to criticize publicly the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for a memorandum he caused to be prepared and sent to the Department of Defense, dealing with the intervention of the military in partisan politics.

I have risen in the past in defense of one of the ablest and most beloved Members of this body, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I regret that some of his colleagues have undertaken to criticize him.

The memorandum which he sent to the Department of Defense, in my judgment, is a State paper worthy of careful study by all Americans determined to keep elected civilian leaders in charge of our policy, rather than turning it over to the military.

I am most happy that the President of the United States undertook, at his press conference yesterday, to support the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. The President pointed out that the U.S. military, due to one of the wisest actions of our constitutional founders, have been kept out of politics, and that they should stay out. He points out what I am sure we all agree with, that nobody desires to restrain or prevent any military man from speaking his mind, but what we are concerned about is that they should not be exploited for partisan purposes.

I would say, further than that, that we should keep the military, like all other experts, on tap, and not on top.

I concur with the President in the view that Senator FULBRIGHT performed a service in letting his views be made known to the Department of Defense.

I concur with the President's wish that every Member of the Senate, on this and every other matter, will continue to give the administration the benefit of his judgment and his support.

I strongly hope that the Committee on Armed Services will not engage in an investigation of this matter, despite the resolution which has been submitted to it. I think we can well leave this matter to the President of the United States.

Again, I reaffirm my strong support for that great American, the junior Senator from Arkansas, WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt of a press report of the President's press conference on this matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. Mr. President, there has been considerable argument in Congress in recent weeks about the proper role of military officers in educating the public on the dangers of communism. Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, wrote a memorandum on it. There have been some orders issued in the Defense Department

a vote of 176 to 140, the House said "No" to the inclusion of public power generating in the atomic energy program.

The vote itself approved an amendment which eliminated the sum of \$95 million for electric generating facilities at a new nuclear explosives producing reactor at Hanford, Wash. The support for this Republican-offered amendment was bipartisan, including Democrats from several Southern States—an area in which political maneuvers by the Kennedy administration have previously succeeded in breaching conservatism. It is encouraging that this vote has been won, because it may indicate a buildup of congressional opposition to a widespread administration assault on power generation by private corporations.

The Hanford project is but one example of this assault. It is a very good example, however, because it illustrates the devious way in which the public power advocates are exploiting every opportunity. A nuclear plant like the one at Hanford has a defense function which is readily identified with the cold war. It is in the business of supplying atomic weapons. The public power provision was slipped into the authorization measure for a free ride. As Raymond Moley wrote on this page recently, the Kennedy administration is determined to use the cold war threat "to bring American industry and American life generally into the grip of a vast Federal socialism."

Arizona and the whole region of the Southwest is one of the target areas. Arizona Public Service Co., along with other private power firms, is fighting against an Interior Department decision to federalize the transmission of electrical energy from the Colorado River storage project. Every conceivable bid for public and congressional support against the private utilities is being made by the Department and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. But the Hanford vote in the House shows that Congress is alert to the tax losses and the bureaucratic encroachment on private business which public power brings.

Not long ago on the Manion Forum, newly elected Republican (and conservative) Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, declared that the Federal Government is guilty of a paternalism that can lead to dictatorship. "We cannot hope to defeat international communism by becoming more and more like the very system that seeks to destroy us," he said.

The steps toward a hopefully benevolent version of that system are frighteningly evident in the New Frontier program. The attempt to spread TVA-style public power into the Western States is part of this socialistic explosion. The private power companies have ample facilities, in production or planned, to provide for present and future requirements—as taxpaying corporations. They must be allowed to do so, or a vast segment of U.S. business will be jeopardized by unfair, tax-free competition under the shadow of a Federal Government seeking to be all powerful.

[From the Williamsport, Pa. Sun-Gazette, July 7, 1961]

TIME TO SAY "No"

Public power advocates are devising a new raid on the pocketbooks of American taxpayers.

In their eagerness to knock out private utility systems and sabotage private enterprise, they have framed two costly proposals they want Congress to enact in its current session.

They are demanding that Uncle Sam add another quarter billion dollars to the tax burdens of all the people for a steam-powered electric generating plant at Hanford, Wash., and transmission lines for distributing the power to be created at the Colorado River storage project.

Each of these undertakings fits into their scheme for a Federal power empire.

There does not appear to be a valid need for either of them so far as national defense or consumer demands for electricity are concerned. Once built, however, they would become competitive with investor-owned power companies.

It is to be remembered in this connection, that private companies are subject to taxation. They pour millions of dollars into the public treasury in Federal, State and local taxes. A Federal power system, on the other hand, pays no taxes and has frequently required concessions and subsidies from the Federal treasury.

Considering how few benefits there are to recommend the Hanford powerplant or the transmission lines, we hope the proposals are rejected and that Congress calls a halt to spending taxpayers' money for no better purpose than to put Government in competition with America's free enterprise system.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, July 12, 1961]

NEW PUBLIC POWER GRAB

As the age of electrical power produced by atomic energy gets its start, Government has added a powerful new tool to those of regulation, taxing and direct competition in attempts to cripple private utilities. The issue appears most clearly in the Hanford, Wash., new production reactor, designed to generate enough power for a city of one million population. Congress will act, probably in a matter of days, on funds for construction of the powerplant as part of the 1962 Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill.

For the backers of Government power, whether it is hydro, steam, or atomic, the Hanford proposal provides a new argument. This time it is "national defense." The proposed plant will be dual-purpose, comprising a plutonium and power producing reactor similar to such an outfit said to be in use in Russia now. If atomic disarmament negotiations with Russia should be successful, it is represented that the plutonium producing part could be shut down, and power production continued—but plutonium could be resumed quickly if atomic weapon needs became apparent.

The double purpose argument, of course, completely ignores the fact that if agreement should be reached it would necessarily extend to such potentials for manufacture of plutonium for bombs. The expectation that Russia might agree to permit operation of an atomic energy electrical powerplant capable of fast conversion to weapons materials is silly. Nevertheless, the national defense argument is being advanced.

Public power has always marched in by way of the back door. Originally, flood control projects were the excuse. Hydro-power was a byproduct, to be sold by Federal agencies at low cost. The fact that all taxpayers in the nation contributed to resulting low regional power rates never has made the slightest dent in the thinking of Federal power advocates. In the TVA area, hydro-power at bargain rates ran short so the Government agency began building ordinary steam generating plants.

If Congress gives approval to the Hanford project, it will mean two things—(1) That Government steam generating plants will be extended to areas outside of TVA; and (2) that the Atomic Power Commission will join the Interior Department and the Army engineers as a third Federal agency in the electrical power business.

Meanwhile, reorganization of the Federal Power Commission in Washington is underway, with every indication that expansion of electrical power systems at taxpayer expense is going to be the policy. The REA already has been assigned a new and ex-

panded role in general "rural development" as well as merely a power-supplier.

Opposition to expansion of government power does not mean that private utilities need be regarded as simon pure, or that they are above taking advantage of their customers, given the opportunity. Rather, the question is one of private enterprise vs. socialism. The utility serving this area, for example, reported taxes amounting to \$11,730,000 last year, which was twice as much as it paid for fuel to generate electricity, and well in excess of its \$10,926,000 operating income.

Such a tax burden obviously places a private business at a vast disadvantage in competition with tax-financed utilities which pay only token fees, have no problems of raising capital and are not expected to net a profit.

The advantages of government operations go to users in favored regions. Not only are low rates offered citizens, but low rates to industry provide distortions in the employment picture. While most citizens, including those in Wisconsin, furnish the taxes, a relatively few reap the benefits. It is one more field in which government can give or it can take away, and where its role as regulator of taxpaying business is suspect because of its own role as competitor.

Cuba file
Cuban Tension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Carlos Todd, editor, Cuban Information Service, Coral Gables, Fla., before the National Association of Manufacturers board of directors, the Drake Hotel, Chicago, Ill., June 8, 1961.

I have read Mr. Todd's address with concern. I do not necessarily subscribe to everything he has said; I do not know the facts as he apparently knows them. I wish I could say that what Mr. Todd has said is not the basis of concern and is not true. Unfortunately, I am very much afraid that such is not the case.

I am not an alarmist, but I am convinced that the American people should have a more realistic understanding of the Cuban situation, which is all too often labeled "tension." I know of no better way of presenting Mr. Todd's remarks to a vast cross section of our population than through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that everyone on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD list will read this address and evaluate it according to his individual dictates.

The address follows:

Gentlemen, I am honored twice today. Never has it been my privilege to address such a distinguished audience, composed of the industrial leaders of the United States. And never did I have the opportunity of visiting this great metropolis of the Middle West, an enormous city of enormous resources, which impresses the new visitor with the energy and activity which have made this country great.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5983

50,000 during the first quarter of this year was underwritten at a rate of 3½ percent or more.

Most of these issues were probably underwritten by the small local dealer who has spent considerable time and effort in developing a local market for his community's securities.

Since President Kennedy, who is not particularly noted for his conservative leanings, had requested Congress to approve only a \$50 million increase in the community facilities program at the interest rates then in effect, we can only surmise that there must have been some plain and fancy political footwork in the Congress to bring about the much more liberal provisions which were finally enacted.

All reasonable individuals, including investment bankers, would agree that where an essential public facility is needed but cannot be financed through private means then the Federal Government should provide the means in one way or another. But we cannot see how or why the Federal Government, now operating at a substantial deficit, should begin providing capital for municipalities when private capital is available at reasonable terms.

Nation in Need of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent daily newspaper of Willows, Calif., the Daily Journal, points out editorially in its July 28, 1961, issue that although there assuredly is no room in the current budget for frills, it is to be hoped that Congress will not consider wealth producing reclamation projects in the West in the category of economic superfluities.

The Willows Journal calls attention to the fact that western reclamation areas for the most part do not produce surplus crops, but rather those vital crops that improve the national diet.

The editorial follows:

NATION IN NEED OF RECLAMATION

In view of the Nation's commitment to a substantial buildup of its armed strength and its ideological war against communism, there is assuredly no room in the budget for frills.

It is to be hoped, however, that Congress does not consider as frills wealth-producing reclamation projects such as the Tehama-Colusa Canal, which will irrigate more than 175,000 acres, mostly of dry-farming land, in this area.

If, as an example, a farmer spends money for a new harvester, which will pay for itself over a period of years and increase his income, to boot, then most assuredly he is indulging in no frill by buying it. On the contrary, he is making a wise capital investment in the future of his farming operation.

So is it with irrigation. The Long Canal, as an example, will increase per-acre dollar value of production more than fivefold, according to a highly conservative Reclamation Bureau estimate.

Not only will farmers make repayments on its cost from their increased receipts from irrigation, but also the higher value of crops and of land provide a larger tax base. The entire economy, not only the farmers and the economy of the area, benefits.

James K. Carr, Under Secretary in the Interior who is well known in Glenn County, made this clear in an address to directors of the National Reclamation Society.

"The reclamation program," he said, "was founded on a firm foundation that Western reclamation development was so valuable to the people of the United States that the national taxpayers would carry the interest charges on the investment necessary to develop the West.

"Western reclamation areas, for the most part, do not produce surplus crops and there is no question that crops on Western reclamation projects are those vital crops that improve the national diet.

"They have been islands of stability during periods of recession. They have slowed the migration of our young people to the cities because they make a better living possible on the land.

"More than that, they have stimulated industrial development and manufacturing enterprises * * * which supply the fabricated materials for these huge projects."

The Long Canal and other such wealth-producing reclamation projects are, indeed, capital investments in the future wealth, stability and power of the United States. Unfortunately, however, the Federal budget, unlike a farmer's or businessman's budget, does not differentiate between current expenditures and capital investments. This, perhaps, is partly responsible for the feeling among some Members of Congress that reclamation costs are to be considered in the same category as current expenditures.

Mr. Carr cited figures showing a dangerous lag in reclamation development during the previous administration.

During the 10 years before World War II an average of one-half of 1 percent of the Federal budget was devoted to reclamation development.

During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, this was cut to five one-hundredths of 1 percent—only one-tenth as much.

Meanwhile, the Nation's population is increasing by 8,000 persons a day, while agricultural land is being gobbled up at the average rate of 3,000 acres a day by subdivisions, highways and other public works.

To longer delay necessary reclamation projects, such as the Red Bluff diversion dam as a start to the Long Canal, would be shortsighted, misguided economy indeed.

E.F.D.

Opposition to the \$95 Million Electric Power Generating Facilities at Hanford, Wash., Is Now Nationwide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the House of Representatives, by a vote of 176-140, deleted from the AEC authorization bill the \$95 million electric power generating plant at Hanford, Wash., my mail contains hundreds of telegrams, editorials, and letters approving the House action. At the same time it is urged that the House should stand firm in its decision.

From Los Angeles comes this expression of support:

It is my sincere desire that you and your colleagues who are alerted to the danger of the Government going into private business

will be able to impress upon other Members of Congress to join you in the mighty stand you took against harnessing the Government's new plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash.

From Marshall, Tex.:

From all appearances this was another example of Federal expansion in the whole electric power field and this would make the AEC emerge as a new Government power agency.

From Cleveland, Ohio:

We oppose \$95 million project at Hanford, Wash., to produce electric energy for commercial use. We believe this is the domain of private utility industry.

From Chicago, Ill.:

This project adds nothing to technology * * * the power is not needed * * * coal is a vital link in national defense and the industry and its employees would be injured.

From Huntington, W. Va.:

We continue to oppose inclusion of \$95 million for electric facilities at Hanford, Wash., because we believe that the proposed conversion of Hanford to the generation of power would be contrary to the best interest of the coal industry.

The following four editorials are a sample of the many appearing nationwide in opposition to the \$95 million Hanford project:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, July 19, 1961]

HOUSE SAYS "NO" TO PUBLIC POWER MOVE

Ever since Government power advocates got their big feet in the door under Franklin Roosevelt, electric energy produced by Government agencies has grown from about 5 percent of the national total to about 23 percent.

Growth of public power dropped off somewhat under the Eisenhower administration. But under the New Frontier, the push is on again.

Public power seemed necessary enough a quarter century ago. Private utilities had lagged in extending electricity to rural areas. Rates were high. But times have changed now, and private utilities are meeting growth and price responsibilities.

Fortunately, Congress put the brakes on expanded public power, at least for the moment, in a significant vote the other day. The House rejected, 176 to 140, the Kennedy administration's proposal to convert the plutonium-producing reactor at Hanford, Wash., into a powerplant at a cost of \$95 million.

This move is aimed at putting the Government into the atomic power business for the first time. Its result, in our view, would be to create a dangerous precedent and, at the same time, produce power inefficiently in an area where power needs are being amply met.

In the field of atomic energy, private companies have put \$600 million into research to produce A-power at prices competitive with conventionally produced energy.

The big reason for expanding Government power into new fields in the face of that record seems to be a desire to reduce the role of private power. Wherever that motive is apparent, we hope Congress continues to stamp on it, hard.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, July 15, 1961]

TURNBACK ON THE TVA PATH

What may be a significant victory for free enterprise, in the currently crucial area of private versus public power, was won Thursday in the U.S. House of Representatives. By

When I was asked to speak to you, I was given a great latitude of choice in subject matter. It is my intention to discuss today "Tension in the Caribbean," a theme that has been ever-present in the news for the past 30 months.

I deliberately picked on the misnomer "tension," to show the fallacy that lies in the use of that word when it is applied to the Caribbean situation today.

I am a Cuban citizen, born in Cuba, who has lived most of his adult life in that lovely and unfortunate island. As a political editor of the newspaper Times of Havana, I lived through nearly 2 years of the frightful fiasco that is the so-called Castro revolution—in reality the Communist conquest of Cuba.

I have been witness to the total eradication of all freedoms in Cuba; to the destruction of its wealth and industry by the Red invaders; to the studied dismemberment of the Cuban family; and to the poisoning of the minds of young and old, to the degree where mountainous hatreds have been deliberately instilled into the hearts of a people who were once gay and happy and carefree.

I have seen all this happen before my very eyes; and I cannot dismiss it, as so many people do, with the word "tension." For you hear today about tension in Laos, in Vietnam, in Berlin, and tension in the Caribbean.

It is totally inadequate to say that I speak to you today about tension in the Caribbean, when the so-called tension has become open warfare to the death.

There may be some among you that still believe that the word "war" implies only much shooting and desolation and nothing else. Only very recently, we have had occasion to witness this type of warfare in the ill-fated, abortive invasion attempt by a handful of young Cubans who willingly sacrificed their lives for the cause of freedom.

Nevertheless, that skirmish—for it was no more than that—was only a small armed engagement which served to accentuate the other kind of war, a war that is being waged relentlessly in the Caribbean and in every corner of this earth, the war for public opinion.

That tyrant and superb politician Adolph Hitler wrote in "Mein Kampf" that public opinion "was the mightiest factor of our time." He used it well and used it to the hilt. He has been surpassed and left far behind by Soviet Russia, which adopted some of his methods and added embellishments of her own.

This war—the war of advertising, for that is what propaganda really is—is being fought with tenacity, intelligence, and diligence by international communism.

The immediate and direct result of this type of warfare is what you call tension, under the accepted semantics of the Western World. But it remains war to the death, no matter what you choose to call it. Mao Tse-tung recognized the principle years ago and wrote, "Politics is war without bloodshed. War is politics with bloodshed."

This tension, this war without bloodshed in the Caribbean, dates from the time that Fidel Castro, together with his Communist master, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, landed in Cuba in December, 1956. From that moment, and throughout the succeeding months, tension increased fearfully within the island of Cuba; but it had not, as yet, reached any appreciable degree outside the country.

Tension in the Caribbean began from that date as it inevitably begins in every single place in the world where the Communists initiate their well tried and successful program of infiltration, subversion, propagandizing, and bribery to secure total power in any area. The Congo, Laos, Viet Nam, Berlin, Cuba—every single focus of tension can be directly attributed to Communist action.

Open bloodless warfare—tension, if you insist in calling it that—intensified and finally burst forth from Cuba with explosive force, immediately after Castro and his Communists came to power on January 1 of 1959.

It became open warfare in the armed sense when the Cuban Communist government attempted an abortive invasion of Panama in April of 1959. It is worthy to note that the invaders were politely returned to Cuba by the Panamanian government. Castro tried again, in August of that year, to invade the Dominican Republic, in an attempt that also died at birth. The seas around the island were containing armed Cuban Communist aggression.

They did not and have not contained the open bloodless warfare, the tension that has spread throughout the countries of South and Central America. It has become impossible to limit that warfare to the Caribbean, to quarantine it, as you would a deadly disease, from the rest of Latin America. It is increasing daily, and it is achieving new victories and faithful adherents in this hemisphere.

It has invaded this country today, and for the last 7 weeks it has become the subject of urgent discussion from the top of the White House down to the home of the humblest citizen who reads newspapers or watches television.

For the origins of this tension, one may begin with the relationship that existed between the United States and the nations of the Caribbean, Central and South America, in the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Those relations were at an all-time high; and the political, commercial, and industrial prestige of this country remained unchallenged in the hemisphere. The cordiality between your neighbors to the south and your Government was a strong bond for hemispheric unity.

Curiously enough, the policy of the "good neighbor" became, unconsciously to Latin American nations, the policy of the "good father." An umbrella of protection—real or imaginary, as you wish—did not permit the intrusion of world power politics on the Latin American scene. The peoples of our countries felt, at that time, that the United States was concerned with their welfare, and reacted accordingly.

It was only after World War II, when militant communism began to march inexorably in every single continent in the world, that the Latin American mind began to have serious doubts of American intentions. Aid in enormous quantities went to reconstruct the ruin of Europe; the Asians receive their share of largesse; African countries began to acquire new importance in world politics; and in their comfortable acceptance of a sure thing, the United States did not turn an eye on Latin America. We became poor relations of no consequence.

Further, and more grievous still, the United States, while leaving the Latin American republics to fend for themselves, resigned its position as the pater familias of the hemisphere; and in doing so, effectively relinquished its position of leadership. You were no longer captain of the vessel. You became a mere member of the crew, defaulting all the privileges of the master of the ship.

You refused to assume the responsibility and the risk that had made you the undisputed leader of this hemisphere; and, instead of a former father, you became a rather questionable uncle.

Nothing had been basically changed in the everyday world of diplomacy, business and industry; but there was a subtle difference in the overall picture that we Latin Americans were quick to notice. In the world of human relationships, there is nothing so appalling and insulting as to be considered "safe" by another person. It is an unspoken insult; and the dividing line between toler-

ance and contempt becomes very blurred under the circumstances.

That was the position in which you found yourself when the specter of communism began to haunt the hemisphere; and you frantically tried to buy and hold tinpot dictators in different Latin American countries to protect your holdings against the advance of the Red hordes. In doing so you played right into Communist hands by actions which brought the inevitable reaction to dictatorships; revolutions, and the installment of the so-called "independent governments of the left." The leadership that you had once assumed and kept for so many years continued to slip from your grasp—and in your paralysis of action and with your political blunders, you continued to make matters worse.

For the liberty of action which you once possessed as the hemispheric leader, had now passed out of your hands. You were the leaders no longer; and our peoples began to look upon you with ever-increasing doubts. In 1958, following the innocent theory that making a better Humpty-Dumpty would clear up matters for all concerned, your aid and your confused torpor unleashed the one force in this hemisphere that you had been so earnestly trying to repel: international communism.

Following the insane belief that the creation of "an independent government of the left" in Cuba would show the rest of Latin America the pristine purity of your intentions, you were—to use one of your expressions—conned into believing in and vitally aiding and abetting the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Not that you were not warned. Your own special Government departments informed your higher authorities of the nature of the hoodlums that run Cuba today before their accession to power. The information and the advice were ignored; and on January 1, 1959, Fidel Castro took over Cuba; and then, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, of the Argentine and international communism, took over Fidel Castro. Your "independent government of the left" became the first firm foothold of the Soviets and the Red Chinese in this hemisphere and you helped them to do it.

Imagine, then, the feeling that has been rising in Latin America since then. Every day that passed brought new insult and calumny from the Cuban Communists; and the United States, the greatest power on this earth sat back and remained wrapped in silent dignity. "El que calla, otorga," says the Spanish proverb—"He who remains silent, relinquishes"—which is exactly the manner in which your actions were interpreted by the people of Latin America. The great nation of the north was great no more. A small speck on the Caribbean could insult it, confiscate its goods, jail its citizens, arrest its diplomats, snub its ambassador, and get away with it.

Oh, you had your troubles. If you intervened, you would be called bullies and aggressors. If you didn't, then you became the goat of the hemisphere and the world.

The picture of a declining United States, enervated, paralyzed, vacillating, robbed of the ability to act, was a delicious one to be enjoyed. You worried about popularity—about what the other fellow would say—in a world that couldn't care less.

For some Latin Americans, the time had come to take sides. Castro said early in 1959, "You are with the revolution or against it." This has become the cry in all Latin America. "You are with communism or against it." And never forget that people always wish to be on the winning side. So far, you are losing.

The recent fiasco in Cuba has only served to confirm that conviction to Caribbean and other Latin American nations. The harm that has been done by the failure of a small expedition is incalculable; and you now

stand on the threshold of a "Gottterdammerung" in this hemisphere.

For the tension, the open warfare that emanated from little Cuba has grown to monstrous proportions in Latin America, and your own security is being threatened, according to the recent words of President Kennedy.

They have served, if only momentarily, to give pause to the Communist offensive; and they have brought some measure of hope to those people of the Caribbean and the hemisphere, which have always looked to the United States as the paladin of freedom and the shield against Communist aggression and intervention.

For the moment only; for that aggression and intervention has been made perfectly evident in the Caribbean today, with a Cuba invaded and conquered by the evil forces that guide the moves of the men of the Kremlin and Peiping.

The Presidential words did not allay the fact that the defeat of an invasion of Communist Cuba has been a major defeat for this country in the eyes of all Latin America and the world. Condemnation for the American-backed invasion in the United Nations and in many Latin American quarters is not a condemnation for U.S. "intervention" in Cuba and I say intervention between quotation marks. The condemnation comes because, in the eyes of the world, this country lost.

Will Rogers said it in well-chosen words, viewing the American political scene years ago, when he stated, "On the day after election, they do not ask you whether you held a nice, clean campaign. The only question they ask you is: Did you win?"

And that is the only question that was asked silently by the nations of Latin America after the failure of the U.S.-backed, Cuban-manned invasion. Did you win? Nothing else. For nothing else matters.

Consider, gentlemen, that these nations who regarded you as a protector—although they paradoxically screamed intervention just recently—have only to glance at the map of the world to judge you a bad security risk.

Within the short space of 16 years, the Communists have won control over more than 800 million people in 13 countries; and they have advanced from their initial base in Russia to win sensational successes in four continents—including North America. It is incontestable to say at this moment that they are winning that war to the death, the war of tension. And it is perfectly evident that, with the exception of the Cuban skirmish, they have done it without resorting to an all-out shooting war.

Indeed, they have won an armed clash at your very doorstep, which has left the people of this country stunned and aghast at their impotence before the Communist invader.

The world knows that the Communist onslaught on Cuba was not an attack on our little island. It was, as it is, a direct attack by Soviet Russia and Communist China on the United States of America. That you have permitted this attack and acknowledged a small armed victory with impunity—no matter what other considerations must be taken into account by you—has not been lost on Latin Americans.

Weak countries, like people, will forever look to the strong for guidance and help. If the United States is not ready to repel the Communist invader, if it does not lead us Latin Americans in the fight against these forces of evil, why should we act? In fact, how can we act against the armed might of Soviet Russia and its Chinese ally, already firmly entrenched across the straits of Florida?

Be certain that no matter how you act, you will find worldwide criticism hurled at you. You are called imperialists and aggress-

sors without sending a single armed man into Cuba. You will be called much worse if you do. The Communists will hold a worldwide propaganda feast, and the United States will be served up with an apple in its mouth.

Yet, if you are to survive as a Nation, if you are to keep what little prestige American power still maintains, you must act, and you must act quickly. Otherwise, Khrushchev's words will become tragically prophetic within a very short time: "Your grandchildren will live under Communism." The man means what he says. He intends to see to it that it becomes a reality.

We Latin Americans are accused of being dramatic, passionate, and mercurial in our ways. Underneath that exterior, we are all hard realists. And it is difficult for us, as realists, to understand exactly how you have permitted such open and arrogant Communist intrusion in your own balliwick, with total impunity for the intruders on our hemispheric and your national security.

It is impossible to deal with the Soviets and the Chinese by conventional methods of modern diplomacy. They operate in exactly the same manner as do your gangsters, who work completely outside human laws and ignore them altogether when it suits their purposes. It is inconceivable that you have not realized, as a nation, that the exact, same methods of Hitler's Germany nearly brought a German victory in Europe for precisely the same reasons. People simply refused to believe that nations could act thus.

It is happening again. But this time the enemy is organized on a worldwide basis and is busily subverting, infiltrating and corrupting the very system that you are called upon to defend * * * and doing it from within your own borders. And you are tacitly permitting him to do so with ghastly unconcern.

Do not believe for one moment that the rest of Latin America is not going to follow in the footsteps of Cuba. The Southern Continent will go entirely Communist; and it will do so very soon, unless you act rapidly to prevent it.

To those of you who still do not believe that a well-organized, aggressive minority can take over a country with frightening ease, let me point to the case of Cuba. And, gentlemen, do not forget that right here, in the United States, a well organized, aggressive minority succeeded in changing your Constitution. Recall the 18th amendment. Recall, please, that a majority of your people bowed to the wishes of a well organized, aggressive minority, which condemned you to years of prohibition.

Meanwhile, the Communists are busy with plans for their Latin American takeover. Czech machineguns are being shipped to Colombian Red elements; and frenzied efforts are being made to unite them into a cohesive and effective force. In Cuba, Castro's guerrilla tutor is training Cubans for the invasion of Venezuela and Panama. The main attack is being directed against Venezuela, where Betancourt's hold becomes more tenuous with every day that passes. Brazil is another danger zone. Only in Peru—where documents of the most incriminating nature were abducted from the Cuban Embassy by Cubans, proving a huge conspiracy against the Peruvian Government—has communism been contained—not defeated.

At the moment, you stand tied hand and foot by the very entangling alliances that George Washington warned against. Whilst Soviet Russia conveniently ignores the United Nations and international treaties when it suits her—and gets away with it—you are ensnared in a web which will eventually smother you to death; and which is now being used with diabolical cleverness to stay your hand in your own defense.

The weapons that you have at hand in the international arena lie forgotten by your former Latin American allies. The Rio

Treaty and the Caracas declaration, which provided the means and the force to cast out communism from this hemisphere, are crumbling into dust.

You are being slowly and inexorably surrounded. Most of Europe is gone. Asia is practically gone. The entire West Coast of Africa, facing the Atlantic, is going. Latin America is about to go.

It does not take much imagination to see the realization of Lenin's dream when he said, "We shall surround the United States. Without having to fire a shot, it will drop into our hands like a ripe fruit."

If this country is to survive, it must accept not only the responsibilities, but also the risks, of power. And it must come to understand one of the basic laws of power: it must be demonstrated or it must be used. Otherwise, power is nonexistent.

As Americans, you are faced with the greatest challenge that history has ever hurled at you. As Americans, you have always been mortal enemies of tyranny and despotism; of mass executions and mass imprisonment; of the concentration camp and the torture chamber; of viciousness and cruelty and oppression. Time and again you have fought against these things; and now you must fight against them once more.

Yesterday, you called these things nazism and you fought them and won. Today these same things are called communism; and again you must fight and win. For if you do not face the issue squarely, you will go down to inevitable defeat, and the entire world will become prey to the forces of evil.

Your forefathers never wavered, never hesitated, never counted the risks, never considered the odds, and they won. You, their descendants, cannot allow this precious heritage to be destroyed.

The fate of the entire world is at stake. You hold too much of the future of mankind to allow it to slip so heartrendingly from your hands.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, a Fine Sailor, an Excellent Leader and Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a noted philosopher once said:

The body politic is composed of three groups of people; the first group doesn't particularly care what happens; the second is satisfied to watch; but the third and smallest group makes things happen.

Adm. Arleigh Burke ranks high in the third group. Whether on the bridge of a rolling destroyer in the South Pacific, on a flattop in the Philippine sea, or at his desk in the Pentagon, Arleigh Burke surrounds himself with action. He has always made things happen. He is retiring July 31 after 37 years of distinguished naval service, but I am confident that wherever he goes he will continue to make things happen for the good of this country.

Being a Navy man myself, I have closely followed Admiral Burke's career since World War II. The unprecedented progress the Navy has made in all phases of sea warfare during his tenure